UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,303	08/29/2003	Lara Mehanna	06975-447001	9022

26171   7590   02/09/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
WEINTROP, ADAM S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>10/651,303</td><td>MEHANNA ET AL.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam S. Weintrop	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 August 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-95</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-95</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 August 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/30/03 6/22/04</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 2-4, 8,10, 13, 14, 42, 45, 47, 51, 54, 57, 59, 76, 78, 85, 88, 90, and 94

are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding **claim 2**, the phrase "generate one or mapping results" on line 14 is an

unclear phrase and should be replaced with – generate one or more mapping results --.

Regarding **claim 3**, the term "a code segment" on line 27 has already been

defined and should be replaced with – the code segment --. The term "a selected

result" on line 27 has also already been defined and should be replaced with –the

selected result --.

Regarding **claim 4**, the term "the characters" in line 30 has not been defined and

lacks antecedent basis. It should be replaced with – characters --.

Regarding **claim 8**, line 15, **claim 45**, lines 13, **claim 57**, line 17, and **claim 88**,

line 17, the term "characters" has already been defined and should be replaced with –

non-completion characters --.

Regarding **claim 10**, line 22, **claim 47**, line 21, **claim 59**, line 24, and **claim 90**,

line 24, the term "characters" has already been defined and should be replaced with –

non-completion characters --.

Regarding **claim 13**, the term "a code segment" on line 2 has already been

defined in a preceding claim and should be replaced with – the code segment --.

Regarding **claim 14**, the term "a host" on line 5 has already been defined in a

preceding claim and should be replaced with – the host --.

Regarding **claim 42**, the term "a code segment" on line 2 has already been defined and should be replaced with – the code segment --. The term "a selected result" on line 2 has also already been defined and should be replaced with –the selected result --.

Regarding **claim 51**, the term "first processor" on line 10 should be replaced with – first application – to establish proper antecedent basis.

Regarding **claim 54**, the terms "a code segment related to a selected result" on line 5 has already been defined and should be replaced with – the code segment related to the selected result --.

Regarding **claim 76**, the step of "identifying a messaging label" on line 22 has not been defined. Changing the claim number to – 72 – is suggested to clarify the method steps.

Regarding **claim 78**, the step of "identifying a messaging label" on line 28 has not been defined. Changing the claim number to – 72 – or – 76 -- is suggested to clarify the method steps.

Regarding **claim 85**, the terms "a code segment related to a selected result" on line 5 has already been defined and should be replaced with – the code segment related to the selected result --.

Regarding **claim 94**, the phrase "is identifying vender information" on line 15 makes the claim confusing. Removal of the phrase would alleviate the problem.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   **Claim 52** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. Claim 52 provides for the use of "presenting information to a

user", but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process,

it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is

indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how

this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 53-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

        Regarding **claims 53, 84, and 95**, the claims are directed towards using a host

and a client together to process data. This host and client are defined in the

specification and are not clearly defined to be hardware structures. Therefore, the

claims do not contain tangible structures. In order for a claim to be statutory, it must

have concrete, tangible, and useful result. The claims are construed as software and

dependent claims 54-83 and 85-94 do not add hardware structures and are rejected for

the same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims **1, 3-8, 11-12, 41-45, 52-57, 60, and 84-88** are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Bauer et al. anticipates a method of presenting information to

a user, the method comprising using a first application to receive a character stream of

one or more non-completion characters that indicate that additional characters may be

received (Column 9, lines 5-22); exchanging the character stream with a host that

analyzes the character stream to generate results that are responsive to a user's

predicted interest (Column 6, lines 21-28); receiving the results (Column 10, lines 42-50,

where the client must receive the results in order to display them); and displaying the

results so that the user may select one of the results to launch a code segment related

to a selected result (Column 10, lines 44-63).

Regarding **claim 3**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 1 further

comprising: using the first application to receive one or more updates to the character

stream (Column 11, lines 6-10); exchanging the updates to the character stream with the host to permit the host to analyze the character stream using the updates to generate updated results that are responsive to the user's predicted interest (Column 10, lines 14-18, and Column 6, lines 21-28); receiving the updated results (Column 10, lines 42-50, where the client must receive the results in order to display them); and displaying the updated results so that the user may select one of the updated results to launch a code segment related to a selected result (Column 10, lines 44-63).

Regarding **claim 4**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 3 wherein exchanging the updates includes exchanging all the characters in the character stream (Column 11, lines 19-22, where the "input buffer" is the entire character stream being in the process of being exchanged with the host).

Regarding **claim 5**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 3 wherein exchanging the updates includes exchanging one or more characters in the character stream that have been received since the character stream was last exchanged (Column 11, lines 6-16, where a new character is added to the input, and this is in the whole process of exchanging the data with a host).

Regarding **claims 6, 43, 55, and 86**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 3, the system of claim 41, the method of claim 53, and the host of claim 84 wherein the text prediction waits for a sufficient amount of data in the character stream to generate accurate results before analyzing the character stream (Column 12, lines 55-57, where waiting for a number of characters is equivalent to waiting for a sufficient amount of data in a character stream).

Regarding **claims 11 and 60**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 1 or claim 53 as required by claim 60, wherein analyzing the character stream includes identifying results that are more responsive to the predicted interest of the user (Column 4, lines 25-29, where the system is described as able to efficiently select a data file that a user wants to access, with analyzing the data stream being a part of the system)

Regarding **claim 12**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 1 wherein displaying the results includes displaying the results that are more responsive to the predicted interest of the user (Column 4, lines 25-29, where the system is described as able to efficiently select a data file that a user wants to access, with displaying the result being a part of the system).

Regarding **claim 41**, Bauer et al. anticipates a system enabling intelligent presenting information to a user, the system comprising a first application structured and arranged to receive a character stream of one or more non-completion characters that indicate that additional characters may be received (Column 9, lines 5-22); a first communication interface structured and arranged to exchange the character stream with a host that analyzes the character stream to generate results that are responsive to a user's predicted interest (Column 6, lines 21-28); a second communication interface structured and arranged to receive the results ((Column 10, lines 42-50, where the client must receive the results in order to display them); and a display device structured and arranged to display the results so that the user may select one of the results to launch a code segment related to a selected result (Column 10, lines 44-63).

Regarding **claim 42**, Bauer et al. anticipates the system of claim 41 further comprising an updating application structured and arranged to: use the first application to receive one or more updates to the character stream (Column 11, lines 6-10); exchanging the updates to the character stream with the host to permit the host to analyze the character stream using the updates to generate updated results that are responsive to the user's predicted interest (Column 10, lines 14-18, and Column 6, lines 21-28); receive the updated results (Column 10, lines 42-50, where the client must receive the results in order to display them); and display the updated results so that the user may select one of the updated results to launch a code segment related to a selected result (Column 10, lines 44-63).

Regarding **claim 52**, Bauer et al. anticipates a method of presenting information to a user, the method comprising: means for using a first application to receive a character stream of one or more non-completion characters that indicate that additional characters may be received (Column 9, lines 5-22); means for exchanging the character stream with a host that analyzes the character stream to generate results that are responsive to a user's predicted interest (Column 6, lines 21-28); means for receiving the results (Column 10, lines 42-50, where the client must receive the results in order to display them); and means for displaying the results so that the user may select one of the results to launch a code segment related to a selected result Column 10, lines 44-63).

Regarding **claim 53**, Bauer et al. anticipates a method of using a host to process information received from a client to return results related to the information, the method

comprising: receiving character stream of one or more non-completion characters that indicate that additional characters may be received (Column 9, lines 5-22); analyzing the character stream to generate results that are responsive to a user's predicted interest (Column 6, lines 21-28); and transmitting the results so that the user may select one of the results to launch a code segment to a selected results (Column 10, lines 42-50).

Regarding **claim 54**, Bauer et al. anticipates the method of claim 53 further comprising: receiving one or more updates to the character stream (Column 11, lines 6-10); analyzing the character stream using the updates to generate updated results that are responsive to the user's predicted interest (Column 10, lines 14-18, and Column 6, lines 21-28); and transmitting the updated results so that the user may select one of the updated results to launch a code segment related to a selected results (Column 10, lines 42-50).

Regarding **claim 84**, Bauer et al. anticipates a host that processes information received from a client to return results related to the information, the host comprising: a first communication interface structured and arranged to receive a character stream of one or more non-completion characters that indicate that additional characters may be received ((Column 9, lines 5-22); a first application structured and arranged to analyze the character stream to generate results that are responsive to a user's predicted interest (Column 6, lines 21-28); a second communication interface structured and arranged to transmit the results so that the user may select one of the results to launch a code segment related to a selected results (Column 10, lines 42-50).

Regarding **claim 85**, Bauer et al. anticipates the system of claim 84 further comprising an updating application structured and arranged to: receive one or more updates to the character stream (Column 11, lines 6-10); analyze the character stream using the updates to generate updated results that are responsive to the user's predicted interest (Column 10, lines 14-18, and Column 6, lines 21-28); and transmit the updated results so that the user may select one of the updated results to launch a code segment related to a selected result (Column 10, lines 42-50).

Regarding **claims 7, 44, 56, and 87**, Bauer et al. discloses delaying analyzing the character stream when there is not sufficient amount of data in the character stream to generate accurate results (Column 12, lines 55-57, where waiting for a number of characters is equivalent to waiting for a sufficient amount of data in a character stream, and the process of waiting is equivalent to delaying analyzing the character stream since the stream is not analyzed until the predetermined amount of data is in the stream).

Regarding **claims 8, 45, 57, and 88**, Bauer et al. discloses waiting until a predetermined number of characters has been entered before analyzing the character stream (Column 12, lines 55-57).

7.   **Claim 95** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ortega et al. (WO 01/80079 A2).

Regarding **claim 95**, Ortega et al. anticipates a host that processes information received from a client to return results related to the information, the host comprising: means for receiving character stream of one or more non-completion characters that

indicate that additional characters may be received (page 6, lines 9-10); means for

analyzing the character stream to generate results that are responsive to a user's

predicted interest (page 5, lines 3-11); and means for transmitting the results so that the

user may select one of the results to launch a code segment related to a selected result

(page 6, lines 10-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   **Claims 2 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Pu et al. (US 6,292,743 B1).

Regarding **claim 2**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described

above except for using a web browser to receive the character stream in an address

line, and then exchanging the character stream with the host to generate one or more

mapping results that are responsive to the user's predictive interest, receiving the

mapping results, and displaying the mapping results with an overview map that the user

may select to display more detailed mapping information. The general concept of using

predictive text entry with searching for maps is well known in the art as illustrated by Pu

et al. Pu et al. discloses a GPS system that can receive user entry and retrieve

mapping information. Pu et al. discloses predictive text entry in column 11, lines 58-64.
Pu et al. then goes on to disclose that the user input is from a web server interface in
Figure 3, Item 302. This is similar to using the address line of a web browser to retrieve
information. Pu et al. discloses exchanging the character stream with the host to
generate one or more mapping results that are responsive to the user's predictive
interest in Column 7, lines 44-49. Pu et al. discloses receiving and displaying the map
results, with the ability that a user can display more mapping information in column 8,
lines 57-59, and in column 8, lines 27-30, where the user can have the preference of
displaying a custom route. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art
at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. with the use of the mapping data in order
to provide the users of the system with routes and maps of the items they are searching
for to increase the content and use of the searching system in regards to where the item
they are searching for is located.

Regarding **claim 20**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described
above except for displaying the results with a map related to the character stream. The
general concept of using predictive text entry with mapping results is well known in the
art as illustrated by Pu et al. Pu et al. discloses a GPS system with predictive text entry
in column 11, lines 58-64. The GPS can display mapping information as results in
column 8, lines 57-59. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to
modify Bauer et al. with mapping results as taught by Pu et al. in order to increase the
user's content and the use of the searching system so the user known where the item
they are searching for is located.

10.   Claims **9-10, 46-47, 58-59, and 89-90** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Miller (US 5,896,321).

Regarding **claims 9, 46, 58, and 89**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the

limitations as described above but does not disclose delaying analyzing the character

stream for a predetermined amount of time as required by claims 46 and 89 or judging a

sufficient amount of data by an amount of time as required by claims 9 and 58. The

general concept of delaying analyzing a character stream for predictive text after a

predetermined amount of time is well known in the art as illustrated by Miller. Miller

discloses a predictive text entry system that can wait a predetermined amount of time

since the user last entered a new character in the character stream (column 12, lines

10-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify Bauer et al. with waiting for sufficient data with regards to a time as

taught by Miller in order to decrease processing time.

Regarding **claims 10, 47, 59, and 90**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations

as described above except for waiting until a predetermined number of characters has

been entered unless a predetermined amount of time has elapsed since a new

character has been entered in determining whether there is sufficient data in the

character stream. The general concept of waiting until a predetermined number of

characters has been entered unless a predetermined amount of time has elapsed since

a new character ahs been entered in determining whether there is sufficient data in the

character stream is well known in the art as illustrated by Miller. Miller discloses waiting

a predetermined amount of time before proceeding with predictive text analysis in

Figure 4, Item 408, while Bauer et al. discloses waiting for a predetermined amount of

characters in column 12, lines 55-57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al's waiting for a predetermined

amount of characters with waiting for a predetermined amount of time as taught by

Miller in order to increase processing time and accuracy of the prediction system.

11.   Claims **15, 16, and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Pingel (EP 1 054 329 A2).

Regarding **claims 15, 16, and 17,** Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as

described above except for enabling the user to configure the application to control an

operating mode as required by claim 15, to control what databases to be accessed as

required by claim 16, and a format for which the results are displayed as required by

claim 17. The general concept of adding user controls to a predictive text entry system

is well known in the art as illustrated by Pingel. Pingel discloses allowing the user to

control the operating mode of his predictive text input system in column 8, lines 27-33,

where Pingel describes that the user can change the predetermined number of

characters required to analyze a character stream. Pingel also discloses allowing a

user to choose what databases are to be accessed in column 8; lines 3-19, where the

user can choose what document reservoir or database are accessed. Pingel discloses

enabling a user to control the format of the displayed results in column 7, lines 45-49. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

modify Bauer et al. with these user controls as taught by Pingel in order to customize

the user's experience for compatibility among different user groups.

12.   **Claims 13, 40, and 83** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Kyne et al. (US 6,615,237

B1).

Regarding **claim 13**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described

above except for having the user launch a second application that is different from the

application that accepts the character stream. The general concept of launching a

second application from a text entry box that is different from the application that

contains the text entry box is well known in the art as illustrated by Kyne. Kyne

discloses that a web browser accepts text in the address box, and if the text identifies

another computer in a network, the user is granted access to that computer in Figure 4,

Item 210. That process is similar to launching a different application from a text box. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

modify Bauer et al. with the ability to launch different applications from the text box as

taught by Kyne in order to enhance what the user can access from one text box

location.

Regarding **claims 40 and 83**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as

described above except for validating URLs in the character stream. The general

concept of validating a URL in a predictive text box is well known in the art as illustrated

by Kyne. Kyne discloses that a user can enter text in the address box of a web browser

that can be sent to a search engine, but if the text is a URL, then it retrieves the URL

(Figure 4, Items 204 and 206). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. with validating URLs as taught by Kyne

in order to enhance what the user can access from one text box location.

13.   **Claims 14, 19, 35-39, 48, 61-66, 79-82, and 91** are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Ortega et

al. (WO 01/80079 A2)

Regarding **claims 14 and 61**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as

described above except for polling multiple databases to identify results in the exchange

of the character stream. The general concept of polling multiple databases to identify

results in the exchange of the character stream is well known in the art as illustrated by

Ortega et al. Ortega et al. discloses that his auto completion system can provide for

functionality for multiple, distinct, databases (page 5, lines 33-34). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. to

include polling multiple databases to identify results in the exchange of the character

stream as taught by Ortega et al. in order to increase the number of results and add

content to the system.

Regarding **claims 19 and 66**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as

described above except for analyzing the character stream to determine a user profile,

storing the user profile, and using the user profile to analyze subsequent character

streams from the first application. The general concept of using a user profile to assist

in searching is well known in the art as illustrated by Ortega et al. Ortega et al.

discloses that his auto completion system can provide for user profiles. Ortega et al.

discloses that his system analyzes the character stream for a user profile, stores the

profile, and uses it for searches (page 8, lines 17-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. to include analyzing the character stream to determine a user profile, storing the user profile, and using the user profile to analyze subsequent character streams as taught by Ortega et al. in order to customize the search and help assist the users.

Regarding **claims 35-36 and 79-80**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described above except for storing the results for subsequent access as required by claims 35 and 79 or storing the results the user has selected as required by claims 36 and 80. The general concept of storing the results the user has selected or storing for subsequent access is well known in the art as illustrated by Ortega et al. Ortega et al. discloses that his auto completion system can store the result sets (page 7, lines 34-35, and page 8, lines 1-3). These results can be processed by another system (page 8, lines 3-6), which is similar to accessing them again. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. to include storing the results the user has selected as taught by Ortega et al. in order to assist with further searches and log data to help administrators monitor the system.

Regarding **claims 37-39, and 81-82**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described above except for using the first application to receive a second stream of characters, accessing stored results, relating the stored results, displaying the results as required by claims 38 and 81-82, and repeating the character exchange if none of the results relate to the second stream as required by claim 39. The general concept of relating stored results to a second stream is well known in the art as illustrated by

Ortega et al. Ortega et al. discloses that a query log is created when a search is

performed, which creates stored results (page 7, lines 34-35 and page 8, lines 1-3).

This query log is used with new searches, which are second streams, by accessing the

query log and relating the query log to the second stream and then displaying the

results (page 8, 15-20). If the query log does not add any related search help to the

second stream, Ortega et al.'s system would simply repeat itself and create a new query

log for the current search, since the query logs do not limit the search a user can

perform, just assist as noted in page 8, lines 19-23. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. with using

second stream relations as taught by Ortega et al. in order to tailor the search to the

user to increase user personalization.

Regarding **claims 48 and 91**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as

described above except for a second application structured and arranged to analyze the

character stream to determine a user profile, storage structured and arranged to store

the user profile, and a third application structured and arranged to use the user profile to

analyze subsequent character streams from the first application. The general concept

of using a user profile to assist in searching is well known in the art as illustrated by

Ortega et al. Ortega et al. discloses that his auto completion system can provide for

user profiles. Ortega et al. discloses that his system analyzes the character stream for

a user profile, stores the profile, and uses it for searches (page 8, lines 17-19). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify

Bauer et al. to include analyzing the character stream to determine a user profile,

storing the user profile, and using the user profile to analyze subsequent character

streams as taught by Ortega et al. in order to customize the search and help assist the

users.

Regarding **claims 62-65**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described

above except for enabling a service provider to configure the application to control an

operating mode as required by claim 62, the databases as required by claim 63, the

display format as required by claim 64, and a drop-down menu as required by claim 65.

The general concept of using the service provider to control these functions is well

known in the art as illustrated by Ortega et al. In Ortega et al.'s system, solely the

service provider configures it. There are no user-defined parameters and it is provided

by the service provider as noted in page 4, lines 22-24. The database selection is also

performed by the service provider as noted in page 9, lines 23-25. The display format

and it being displayed in a drop-down format controlled by the service provider is

described in page 6, lines 9-11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. with service provider controls as

taught by Ortega et al. in order to provide a standard interface for all users to view.

14.   **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et

al. (US 6,751,603 B1) and Pingel (EP 1 054 329 A2) as applied to claim 17 above, and

further in view of Ortega et al. (WO 01/80079 A2).

Regarding **claim 18**, Bauer et al. and Pingel disclose all of the limitations except

for using a drop-down box for display. The general concept of using a drop-down box

for displaying results in a predictive text box is well known in the art as illustrated by

Ortega et al. Ortega et al. discloses the drop down box for text entry in page 6, lines 9-11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. and Pingel with a drop-down box as taught by Ortega et al. in order to standardize the results screen with other graphical user interface items to make the user more comfortable in the system.

15.   **Claims 21-28, 49-50, 67-74, and 92-93** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Harrington (US 5,895,454).

Regarding **claims 21-28, 49-50, 67-74, 92-93**, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described above except for analyzing the character stream to determine if it has map information as required by claim 21 and 67, a commonly used address term as required by claims 22 and 68, a zip code as required by claims 23 and 69, a state identifier as required by claims 24 and 70, a city identifier as required by claims 24 and 71, vendor information as required by claims 26, 49, 72, and 92, yellow page information as required by claims 27 and 73, and category and location of the vendor as required by claims 28, 50, 74, and 93. The general concept of analyzing character streams for all these field of data is well known in the art as illustrated by Harrington. Harrington discloses a search engine system that analyzes the user's input for mapping information, country, city, or region (commonly used address term, zip code, or state, or location), nature of the goods (vendor information and category, or yellow page information) in column 5, lines 25-50. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. to examine these fields of data as taught by Harrington in order to provide a more custom search for the user.

16.   **Claims 29-31, 51, and 94** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) in view of Tafoya et al. (US 6,829,607 B1).

Regarding claims 29-31, 34, 51, and 94, Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described above except for analyzing the character stream for a messaging label as required by claims 29, 51, 75, and 94, the messaging label including the "@" sign as required by claim 34, displaying the results which includes a messaging code segment as required by claim 30, and analyzing the character stream for a user identifier as required by claim 31. The general concept of analyzing character streams for messaging labels and acting upon them is well known in the art as illustrated by Tafoya et al. Tafoya et al. discloses a text prediction system for electronic messaging. Tafoya et al. describes a system where the character stream is analyzed for a messaging label such as a "friendly name" or a real e-mail address. The real email address includes the "@" sign and that will instruct the system to search the email addresses and not friendly names. Either way the text prediction will bring up the results, therefore analyzing the character stream for messaging labels that produce real address book contacts. This is described in column 8, lines 30-51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. with analyzing the character stream for messaging labels as taught by Tafoya et al. in

order to adapt the predictive text entry for use with electronic messaging, therefore creating a more universal system.

17.   **Claims 32-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) and Tafoya et al. (US 6,829,607 B1) as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of TNT (http://web.mit.edu/tarvizo/OldFiles/elisp/tnt-2.4/).

Regarding **claims 32-33,** Bauer et al. discloses all of the limitations as described above except for determining if a user is online by using a user identifier as required by claim 32, and enabling the user to exchange an instant message as required by claim 33. The general concept of using a predictive text entry system with instant messenger is well known in the art as illustrated by TNT. TNT is software developed for use with an instant messenger apparatus. It describes using an auto completion method to send instant messages and therefore determining if a user is online as well with the "tnt-im" module located on page 4, in lines 5-8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al. and Tafoya et al. to include instant messaging abilities as taught by TNT in order to expand the use of the system and make it more universally applied.

18.   **Claims 75, 76 and 78** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 6,751,603 B1) and Harrington (US 5,895,454) as applied to claim 72 above, and further in view of Tafoya et al. (US 6,829,607 B1).

Regarding **claims 75, 76 and 78**, Bauer et al. and Harrington disclose all of the limitations as described above except for analyzing the character stream for a messaging label as required by claim 75, including the "@" sign as required by claim 78,

and analyzing the character stream for a user identifier as required by claim 76. The

general concept of analyzing character streams for messaging labels and acting upon

them is well known in the art as illustrated by Tafoya et al. Tafoya et al. discloses a text

prediction system for electronic messaging. Tafoya et al. describes a system where the

character stream is analyzed for a messaging label such as a "friendly name" or a real

e-mail address. The real email address includes the "@" sign and that will instruct the

system to search the email addresses and not friendly names. Either way the text

prediction will bring up the results, therefore analyzing the character stream for

messaging labels that produce real address book contacts. This is described in column

8, lines 30-51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to modify Bauer et al. and Harrington with analyzing the character stream

for messaging labels as taught by Tafoya et al. in order to adapt the predictive text entry

for use with electronic messaging, therefore creating a more universal system.

19.   **Claim 77** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et

al. (US 6,751,603 B1) Harrington (US 5,895,454), and Tafoya et al. (US 6,829,607 B1)

as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of TNT

(http://web.mit.edu/tarvizo/OldFiles/elisp/tnt-2.4/).

Regarding **claim 77**, Bauer et al., Harrington and Tafoya et al. disclose all of the

limitations as described above except for determining if a user is online by using a user

identifier. The general concept of using a predictive text entry system with instant

messenger is well known in the art as illustrated by TNT. TNT is software developed for

use with an instant messenger apparatus. It describes using an auto completion

method to send instant messages and therefore determining if a user is online as well

with the "tnt-im" module located on page 4, in lines 5-8. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bauer et al., Harrington

and Tafoya et al. to include instant messaging abilities as taught by TNT in order to

expand the use of the system and make it more universally applied.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Comer et al. (US 5,845,300) discloses a predictive text entry system that is

dynamic in that it updates its database of suggestions according to the current set of

databases.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam S. Weintrop whose telephone number is 571-270-

1604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-

5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Frantz Jules can be reached on 571-272-6681. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AW

1/25/07

                                              FRANTZ JULES
                                    SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER